

### Remarks

Claims 38-58 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1-37 are cancelled, and new claims 38-58 are added, as shown on pp. 2-7 of the Reply.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and new claims herein.

#### **I. Rejection of Claims 17-24, 33, 36 and 37 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 17-24, 33, 36 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,444,768 to Lemaire *et al.* (hereinafter, “Lemaire”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,896,444 to Perlman (hereinafter, “Perlman”). Claims 17-24, 33, 36 and 37 are now cancelled and the rejection of such claims is therefore rendered moot.

However, to advance the prosecution of the application, Applicant’s representative submits that previously-presented claims 17-24, 33, 36, 37 include one or more features that are related to those in new claims 38-45, 57 and 58. Applicant’s representative submits that neither Lemaire nor Perlman, alone nor in combination, teach or suggest each of the features of new claims 38-45, 57 and 58.

New claim 38 is directed to an electronic document answering machine.<sup>1</sup> In particular, new independent claim 38 recites:

An electronic document answering machine comprising: . . . an alert device comprising a light emitting device, wherein the alert device is configured to **illuminate the light emitting device based on at least the at least one new document being received and stored in the memory of the electronic document answering machine and not yet reviewed.** . . . (Emphasis added).

In both the Office Action dated May 8, 2009 (hereinafter, “May 2009 Office Action”), and in the instant Office Action, the Patent Office cites to the same portion of Lemaire as disclosing the feature previously-recited as “an electronic document answering machine comprising . . . an alert device for signaling that at least one new document is waiting to be reviewed” in now-cancelled independent claim 17.

---

<sup>1</sup>New claim 38 recites one or more features that are similar to those previously-recited in now-cancelled independent claim 17.

Applicant's representative respectfully disagrees that the reference discloses subject matter within the scope of this claim recitation. Applicant's representative also submits that neither Lemaire nor Perlman, alone nor in combination, teach or suggest the features recited as "an electronic document answering machine comprising . . . an alert device comprising a light emitting diode (LED), wherein the alert device is configured to **illuminate the light emitting device based on at least the at least one new document being received and stored in the memory of the electronic document answering machine and not yet reviewed**" (emphasis added) in new independent claim 38.

First, regarding the above assertion in the Office Action, Applicant's representative reiterates that, as discussed in the Reply of Office Action filed August 7, 2009 (hereinafter, "August 2009 Reply"), Lemaire discloses in column 7, lines 6-21 that "portable computer device 10 . . . includes a 'busy' lamp 33 which is utilized to provide an indication of whether or not **communication** between portable computer device 10 and a remote central message facility is occurring" (emphasis added). However, Applicant's representative respectfully clarifies that the communication, or establishment thereof, as disclosed in Lemaire does not disclose the feature recited as "an electronic document answering machine comprising . . . an alert device comprising a light emitting diode (LED), wherein the alert device is configured to **illuminate the light emitting device based on at least the at least one new document being received and stored in the memory of the electronic document answering machine and not yet reviewed**" (emphasis added) in new independent claim 38. Rather, as clarified in FIG. 6, and below in the corresponding text at column 14, lines 14 – 60, Lemaire discloses that the establishment of communication indicated by turning on the busy lamp is merely the connectivity of **a wired or wireless telephone system interface to the portable computer device 10** when Lemaire states:

Referring to FIG. 6, there is depicted a high level flow chart illustrating the 'communication' mode of portable computer device 10 . . . . [W]hen communication switch 38 has been operated, the process passes to block 30. **Block 130 illustrates a determination of whether or not the telephone system interface is present. That is, whether or not portable computer device 10 is linked to a telephone 33 network utilizing telephone cable 35 . . . or alternatively, by utilizing cellular technology.** If no interface with a telephone system is detected, the process returns to block 30 and continues to poll the switches . . . . **However, in the event a telephone system interface is present, as determined at**

**block 130, the process passes to block 132. Block 132 depicts the turning on of ‘busy’ lamp 33 (see FIG. 1A and 1B) and the blinking of ‘busy’ lamp 33 at a predetermined rate . . . . Thereafter, the process passes to block 134. (Emphasis added).**

Accordingly, turning on the busy lamp is indicative of the **portable computer device being connected to a telephone network**, and not indicative the feature recited as “an electronic document answering machine comprising . . . an alert device comprising a light emitting diode (LED), wherein the alert device is configured to **illuminate the light emitting device based on at least the at least one new document being received and stored in the memory of the electronic document answering machine and not yet reviewed**” (emphasis added) in new independent claim 38.

As further evidence that turning on the busy lamp is not indicative of the feature recited as “an electronic document answering machine comprising . . . an alert device comprising a light emitting diode (LED), wherein the alert device is configured to **illuminate the light emitting device based on at least the at least one new document being received and stored in the memory of the electronic document answering machine and not yet reviewed**” (emphasis added) in new independent claim 38, at column 14, lines 35-50, Lemaire further discloses that the busy lamp is turned on **before** the portable computer device and the remote central message facility **transmit messages** when Lemaire continues the disclosure provided above:

**Block 134 illustrates the establishment of communication with a first remote message facility.** Those skilled in the electronic communication art will appreciate that this may be accomplished utilizing modem type technology wherein a DTMF chip is utilized to simulate the dialing of a touch-tone telephone . . . . **[T]he establishment of communication between portable computer device 10 and a remote central message facility may also include the automatic proffer of selected passwords or access identifiers by portable computer device 10, in order to establish the identity of the user of that device.** Thereafter, the process passes to block 36. (Emphasis added).

Accordingly, the **busy lamp is turned on at block 132** when the interface between the telephone system and the portable computer device is connected and **before** any passwords or other information or messages are exchanged between the portable computer device and the remote central message facility. Accordingly, the busy lamp is turned on before the portable

computer device **uploads or downloads documents to or from the remote central message facility** (and before the portable computer devices knows whether there are any documents to upload or download to or from the remote central message facility).

Lemaire even further clarifies that the **busy lamp is turned on prior to and not related to** the feature recited as “an electronic document answering machine comprising . . . an alert device comprising a light emitting diode (LED), wherein the alert device is configured to **illuminate the light emitting device based on at least the at least one new document being received and stored in the memory of the electronic document answering machine and not yet reviewed**” (emphasis added) in new independent claim 38, when, in column 14, line 50 – column 15, line 8 Lemaire describes the operation at block 136, which is **after** the operation at block 132 (at which the busy lamp is turned on):

Block 136 illustrates a determination of whether or not any messages . . . are contained within portable computer device 10 which need to be uploaded to the remote central message facility. If so, the process passes to block 138. Block 138 illustrates the transmittal of those messages utilizing any acceptable data transmission format to the remote central message facility . . . . **Next, after completion of the uploading of all messages to the remote central message facility, the process passes to block 140. Block 140 illustrates the downloading of any messages stored at the remote central message facility.** (Emphasis added).

Accordingly, the **busy lamp disclosed in Lemaire is turned on prior to and not related to** the feature recited as “an electronic document answering machine comprising . . . an alert device comprising a light emitting diode (LED), wherein the alert device is configured to **illuminate the light emitting device based on at least the at least one new document being received and stored in the memory of the electronic document answering machine and not yet reviewed**” (emphasis added)” (emphasis added) in new independent claim 38.

For at least these reasons, Applicants’ representative submits that Lemaire does not teach or suggest the feature recited as “an electronic document answering machine comprising . . . an alert device comprising a light emitting diode (LED), wherein the alert device is configured to **illuminate the light emitting device based on at least the at least one new document being received and stored in the memory of the electronic document answering machine and not yet reviewed**” (emphasis added) in independent claim 38. Perlman does not cure this deficiency.

Perlman discloses a system including a WebTV™ server, a WebTV™ client and a WebTV™ box communicatively coupled to one another, and a signal at the **WebTV™ box** being activated based on an email message **stored at a location other than the WebTV™ box (i.e., stored at the WebTV™ server)**. Specifically, Perlman discloses, at column 7, line 63 – column 8, line 11:

The present invention also provides conventional e-mail capabilities. E-mail addressed to a WebTV™ user is **stored in the WebTV™ server 5**. When e-mail addressed to the user is received by the server 5, the server 5 signals this fact to the client 1 if the client 1 is presently connected to the server 5. Upon receiving this signal, the client 1 provides an **indication to the user that the user has e-mail [at the server]**. The indication is provided in the form of a lighted LED (Light-Emitting Diode) built into the housing of WebTV™ box 10, a text message displayed on television set 12, or both. (Emphasis added).

Accordingly, Perlman does not teach or suggest the feature recited as “an **electronic document answering machine comprising . . . an alert device comprising a light emitting device, wherein the alert device is configured to illuminate the light emitting device based on at least the at least one new document being received and stored in the memory of the electronic document answering machine and not yet reviewed**” (emphasis added) in new claim 38.

Therefore, neither Lemaire nor Perlman, alone nor in combination, teach or suggest each of the features recited in new independent claim 38. For at least this reason, Applicant’s representative respectfully requests that the claim be allowed.

New dependent claim 45 is directed to another electronic document answering machine. In particular, new dependent claim 45 recites:

The electronic document answering machine of claim 38, wherein the electronic document answering machine further comprises a plurality of **programmable mail boxes**, wherein a first one of the plurality of programmable mail boxes is **designated for fax messages**, a second one of the plurality of programmable mail boxes is **designated for World Wide Web pages** and a third one of the plurality of programmable mail boxes is **designated for voice messages**. (Emphasis added).

Based on at least the descriptions provided for Lemaire and Perlman above, neither Lemaire nor Perlman, alone nor in combination, teach or suggest the features recited as “a plurality of **programmable mail boxes**, wherein a first one of the plurality of programmable mail boxes is **designated for fax messages**, a second one of the plurality of programmable mail boxes is **designated for World Wide Web pages and** a third one of the plurality of programmable mail boxes is **designated for voice messages**” (emphasis added).

For at least this reason, Applicant’s representative respectfully requests that the claim be allowed.

New dependent claims 39-44 depend from and therefore incorporate each of the features of new independent claim 38. Therefore, new dependent claims 39-44 are allowable for at least the reasons provided for new independent claim 38 as well as for the additional features recited in new dependent claims 39-44. For at least this reason, Applicant’s representative respectfully requests that the claims be allowed.

New independent claim 54 is directed to a computing device.<sup>2</sup> In particular, new independent claim 54 recites:

A computing device, comprising: a retriever configured to access one or more remote sources and retrieve and store in memory of the computing device at least one new digital document addressed to an addressee associated with the computing device; an input device having at least one light emitting device included in the input device, **wherein the at least one light emitting device is configured to become illuminated based on at least the at least one new digital document being stored in the memory of, and ready for review at, the computing device.** . . . (Emphasis added).

For similar reasons to those provided for new independent claim 38, neither Lemaire nor Pearlman, alone nor in combination, teach or suggest the features recited as “an input device having at least one light emitting device included in the input device, **wherein the at least one light emitting device is configured to become illuminated based on at least the at least one new digital document being stored in the memory of, and ready for review at, the**

---

<sup>2</sup> New independent claim 54 recites one or more features that are similar to those previously-recited in now-cancelled independent claim 33.

**computing device”** (emphasis added) in new independent claim 54. For at least this reason, Applicant’s representative respectfully requests that claim 54 be allowed.

New independent claim 57 is directed to a method.<sup>3</sup> In particular, new independent claim 57 recites:

A method, comprising: accessing at least one remote source of electronically addressable digital documents addressed to an addressee; receiving and storing in memory at least one of the electronically addressable digital documents addressed to the addressee, wherein the receiving and the storing is based on at least the accessing the at least one remote source; **initiating illumination of a light emitting device based on at least the storing in memory the at least one of the electronically addressable digital documents.** . . . (Emphasis added).

For similar reasons to those provided for new independent claim 38, neither Lemaire nor Pearlman, alone nor in combination, teach or suggest the features recited as **“initiating illumination of a light emitting device based on at least the storing in memory the at least one of the electronically addressable digital documents”** (emphasis added) in new independent claim 57. For at least this reason, Applicant’s representative respectfully requests that claim 57 be allowed.

New dependent claim 58 depends from and therefore incorporates each of the features of new independent claim 57. Therefore, new claim 58 is allowable for at least the reasons provided for new independent claim 57 as well as for the additional features recited in new dependent claim 58. For at least this reason, Applicant’s representative respectfully requests that claim 58 be allowed.

## **II. Rejection of Claims 25-28, 34 and 35 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 25-28, 34 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,444,768 to Lemaire *et al.* (hereinafter, “Lemaire”) in view U.S. Patent No. 5,896,444 to Perlman (hereinafter, “Perlman”) and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,666,530

---

<sup>3</sup> New independent claim 57 recites one or more features that are similar to those previously-recited in now-cancelled independent claim 36.

to Clark *et al.* (hereinafter, “Clark”). Claims 25-28, 34 and 35 are now cancelled and the rejection of such claims is therefore rendered moot.

However, to advance the prosecution of the application, Applicant’s representative submits that previously-presented claims 25-28, 34 and 35 include one or more features that are similar to those in new claims 46-50, 55 and 56. Applicant’s representative submits that neither Lemaire nor Perlman nor Clark, alone nor in combination, teach or suggest each of the features of new claims 46-50, 55 and 56.

New independent claim 46 is directed to an electronic document answering system.<sup>4</sup> In particular, new independent claim 46 recites:

An electronic document answering system in a personal computer (PC), the electronic document answering system comprising: means for retrieving documents, wherein the means for retrieving documents is configured to access one or more remote sources and retrieve and store one or more new digital documents; means for providing a light emitting device alert, wherein the means for providing the light emitting device alert is configured to **illuminate a light emitting device to signal that the one or more new digital documents have been retrieved and stored and are ready for review.** (Emphasis added).

For similar reasons to those provided for new independent claim 38, neither Lemaire nor Perlman, alone nor in combination, teach or suggest the features recited as “means for providing a light emitting device alert, wherein the means for providing the light emitting device alert is configured to **illuminate a light emitting device to signal that the one or more new digital documents have been retrieved and stored and are ready for review**” (emphasis added) in new independent claim 46. Clark does not cure this deficiency.

In the Abstract, Clark discloses a handheld computer that contains a liquid crystal display (LCD) having a digitizing surface to allow pen input. Accordingly, Clark also does not teach or suggest, the features recited as “means for providing a light emitting device alert, wherein the means for providing the light emitting device alert is configured to **illuminate a light emitting device to signal that the one or more new digital documents have been retrieved and stored and are ready for review**” (emphasis added) in new independent claim 46.

---

<sup>4</sup> New independent claim 46 recites one or more features that are similar to those previously-recited in now-cancelled independent claim 25.



For at least this reason, Applicant's representative submits that neither Lemaire nor Perlman nor Clark, alone nor in combination, teach or suggest the features recited in new independent claim 46. For at least this reason, Applicant's representative respectfully requests that claim 46 be allowed.

Dependent claim 47 is directed to another electronic document answering system. In particular, new dependent claim 47 recites:

The system of claim 46 . . . wherein the means for operating code is configured to base operation on **a first download frequency if the PC is operating in the full power operating mode and a second download frequency if the PC is operating in the reduced-power mode**, the first download frequency being greater than the second download frequency, and **the second download frequency being indicative of one or more rules associated with a time of day, time of month or time of year of operation of the electronic document answering system**. (Emphasis added).

On page seven, the instant Office Action admits that neither Lemaire nor Perlman teach or suggest the feature previously-recited in now-cancelled independent claim 25 as “wherein the means for storage includes special operating code provided for the electronic document answering system to operate during periods of time when the PC is in reduced-power mode and when the PC is in full operating mode” (emphasis added). By extension, neither Lemaire nor Perlman, alone nor in combination, teach or suggest the feature now recited in new claim 47 as “wherein the means for operating code is configured to base operation on **a first download frequency if the PC is operating in the full power operating mode and a second download frequency if the PC is operating in the reduced-power mode**, the first download frequency being greater than the second download frequency, and **the second download frequency being indicative of one or more rules associated with a time of day, time of month or time of year of operation of the electronic document answering system**” (emphasis added).

Clark does not cure this deficiency because it merely discloses operating a handheld computer in a reduced power mode, without any further detail regarding the operation, when it states (in column 5, lines 24-37):

FIG. 4 is an electrical block diagram of the handheld computer H. While a particular organization is illustrated, it is understood that other organizations, supersets, subsets and partitions of the

components can be utilized. A microprocessor 100 forms the core and processing element of the computer H. **Preferably the microprocessor 100 is a 3.3 volt unit for reduced power consumption. The microprocessor 100 can be a unit such as the 486SL from Intel Corporation or other equivalent units which have high performance and include special power down capabilities. Indeed, preferably all of the devices contained in the computer H are 3.3 volt versions to reduce power consumption** and 5 volt logic is utilized only where lower voltage logic is not available or the alternative is not cost effective. (Emphasis added).

Accordingly, based on at least the descriptions provided for Lemaire, Perlman and Clark above, and for at least the reasons provided above with regard to new independent claim 46, from which new dependent claim 47 depends, neither Lemaire nor Perlman nor Clark, teach or suggest the features of new claim 47. For at least this reason, Applicant's representative respectfully requests that claim 47 be allowed.

Dependent claim 48 is directed to another electronic document answering system. In particular, new dependent claim 48 recites:

The system of claim 47, wherein at least one of the one or more rules associated with a time of day, time of month or time of year of operation of the electronic document answering system comprises a selected download frequency to be employed on **calendar holidays**. (Emphasis added).

Based on at least the descriptions provided for Lemaire, Perlman and Clark above, and for at least the reasons provided above with regard to new independent claim 46, from which new dependent claim 48 depends, neither Lemaire nor Perlman nor Clark, teach or suggest the features recited in new claim 48. For at least this reason, Applicant's representative respectfully requests that claim 48 be allowed.

New dependent claims 49-50 depend from and incorporate the features recited in new independent claim 46. Accordingly, for at least the reasons provided for new independent claim 46, neither Lemaire nor Perlman nor Clark, alone nor in combination, teach or suggest each

feature of new dependent claims 49-50. For at least this reason, Applicant's representative respectfully requests that claims 49-50 be allowed.

New dependent claim 55 is directed to another computing device. In particular, new dependent claim 55 recites:

The computing device of claim 54, wherein the retriever is further configured to operate using special code to access the one or more remote sources at **a first selected frequency if the computing device has received an input indicating use of the computing device over a selected past time interval**, and . . . at **a second selected frequency if the computing device has not received the input indicating use of the computing device over the selected past time interval**, wherein the computing device is a **personal computer**. . . (Emphasis added).

Based on at least the descriptions provided for Lemaire and Perlman above, and for at least the reasons provided above with regard to new independent claim 54, from which dependent claim 55 depends, neither Lemaire nor Perlman, alone nor in combination, teach or suggest the features recited as “wherein the retriever is further configured to operate using special code to access the one or more remote sources at **a first selected frequency if the computing device has received an input indicating use of the computing device over a selected past time interval**, and . . . at **a second selected frequency if the computing device has not received the input indicating use of the computing device over the selected past time interval**, wherein the computing device is a **personal computer**” (emphasis added) in new dependent claim 55. Based, at least on the description of Clark provided above, Clark does not cure this deficiency. For at least this reason, Applicant's representative respectfully requests that claim 55 be allowed.

New dependent claim 56 is directed to another computing device. In particular, new dependent claim 56 recites:

The computing device of claim 54, wherein the retriever is further configured to operate using special code to access the one or more remote sources at a selected frequency if the computing device is in a reduced-power state, wherein the selected frequency is based on a **time of year in which the computing device is operating**. . . . (Emphasis added).

Based on at least the descriptions provided for Lemaire and Perlman above, and for at least the reasons provided above with regard to new independent claim 54, from which dependent claim 56 depends, neither Lemaire nor Perlman, alone nor in combination, teach or suggest the features recited as “wherein the retriever is further configured to operate using special code to access the one or more remote sources at a selected frequency if the computing device is in a reduced-power state, wherein the selected frequency is based on a **time of year in which the computing device is operating**” (emphasis added). Based, at least on the description of Clark provided above, Clark does not cure this deficiency. For at least this reason, Applicant’s representative respectfully requests that claim 56 be allowed.

### **III. Rejection of Claims 30-32 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 30-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,052,442 to Cooper, *et al.* (hereinafter, “Cooper”) in view of U.S. Patent 5,896,444 to Perlman (hereinafter, “Perlman”). Claims 30-32 are now cancelled and the rejection of such claims is therefore rendered moot.

However, to advance the prosecution of the application, Applicant’s representative submits that previously-presented claims 30-32 include one or more features that are similar to those in new claims 51-53. Applicant’s representative submits that neither Cooper nor Perlman, alone nor in combination, teach or suggest each of the features of new claims 51-53.

New independent claim 51 is directed to another computing device.<sup>5</sup> In particular, new independent claim 51 recites:

A computing device, comprising: a communication apparatus configured to interface to at least one network store of electronic documents to receive a new set of electronic documents having a delivery address associated with the computing device; . . . an alert device configured to **render video based on at least receipt of the new set of electronic documents having the delivery address**; and an input device configured to request rendering of the new set of electronic documents having the delivery address,

---

<sup>5</sup> New independent claim 51 recites one or more features that are similar to those previously-recited in now-cancelled independent claim 30.

wherein the computing device is communicatively coupled to a television configured to display rendered video. (Emphasis added).

Applicant's representative respectfully submits that Cooper does not teach or suggest the features recited as "an alert device configured to **render video based on at least receipt of the new set of electronic documents having the delivery address**" (emphasis added) in new independent claim 51, either alone or in combination with Perlman.

Cooper merely discloses an internet answering machine and transmitting an **audio signal (e.g., a page) or a textual signal (e.g., a text message)** based on at least the internet answering machine receiving a message. In particular, for example, in column 2, lines 43-59 and in column 5, line 40 – column 6, line 29, Cooper discloses:

The answering machine includes a telephone line interface, a modem, a processor and associated memory, recording means, a speaker, a display, and a keypad or other suitable input means. When the answering machine detects a ring signal on the telephone line to which it is connected, it answers the call. The answering machine plays an outgoing message for the caller to hear and records the caller's incoming voice message. Periodically or at predetermined times, the answering machine may check for email messages by calling a service provider. When the service provider answers the call, the answering machine logs in, downloads and stores at least a portion of email messages that have been received. ... Alternatively to periodically calling the service provider, the answering machine may wait for the service provider to call. ... A method by which the answering machine receives messages and the user reviews them is illustrated in FIG. 2. ... At step 38 processor 10 determines whether [the data access arrangement (DAA)] DAA 14 has received a ring signal on telephone line 5. If a ring signal is received, DAA 14 answers the call at step 40 by placing telephone line 5 in the off-hook state. At step 42 processor 10 uses Calling Number Delivery (CND) circuit 44 to attempt to read the telephone number associated with the caller. In areas in which the local telephone company provides CND service, the number is encoded in the ring signal on the first ring. Alternatively, in other embodiments the calling number may be decoded from DTMF tones or calling tones that the caller provides. Circuit 44 decodes the number and makes it available to processor 10. At step 46 processor 10 compares the number to a pre-stored number, which the user may enter into the system via keypad 18 when initially configuring or setting-up the system. ... The pre-stored number should be that of the user's on-line service provider.

... If the number is not that of the user's on-line service provider, or if CND circuit 44 was unable to read a telephone number in the ring signal, at step 48 processor 10 plays a pre-recorded outgoing message. Processor 10 retrieves the message from memory 12 and provides it to D/A converter 24. The resulting outgoing audio message is transmitted to telephone line 5 via DAA 20. In response to the outgoing message, the caller may leave a voice message. A/D converter 22 receives the incoming audio message from telephone line 5 via DAA 20. At step 50 processor 10 stores the resulting message data in memory 12. **At step 52 processor 10 updates display 16 to reflect the incoming voice message, as described below. (The term "audio message" is sometimes used herein synonymously with the term "voice message"; while a caller typically speaks into the telephone handset to leave a message, the caller may, of course, play music or provide any other type of audible signal.) At step 55 processor 10 determines whether an option has been selected that activates the recipient's pager (not shown) to provide notification that a message has been received. The user may select this paging option using the set-up software. ... If the option is selected, processor 10 initiates a telephone call to a predetermined pager number that the user specifies at set-up time. At step 59 processor 10 sends at least an indication to the pager that a message has been received. If the pager has text display capability, however, processor 10 preferably sends the caller's telephone number. Processor 10 then returns to step 38. (Emphasis added).**

For at least this reason, Cooper does not teach or suggest the features recited as “an alert device configured to **render video based on at least receipt of the new set of electronic documents having the delivery address**” (emphasis added) in new independent claim 51. Based on at least the description of Perlman provided above, Perlman does not cure this deficiency.

Accordingly, neither Cooper nor Perlman, alone nor in combination, teach or suggest the features recited as “an alert device configured to render **video based on at least receipt of the new set of electronic documents having the delivery address**” (emphasis added) in new independent claim 51. For at least this reason, Applicant’s representative respectfully requests that claim 51 be allowed.

New independent claim 52 is directed to another method.<sup>6</sup> In particular, new independent claim 52 recites:

A method, comprising: receiving, from at least one remote network store, one or more new electronic documents having an associated delivery address; storing the one or more new electronic documents in a memory for electronic documents having the associated delivery address; and **automatically rendering a video indication that the one or more new electronic documents are received . . .** (Emphasis added).

For similar reasons to those provided above for new independent claim 51, Applicant's representative respectfully submits that neither Cooper nor Perlman, alone nor in combination, teach or suggest the feature recited as "**automatically rendering a video indication that the one or more new electronic documents are received**" (emphasis added) in new independent claim 52. For at least this reason, Applicant's representative respectfully requests that claim 52 be allowed.

New dependent claim 53 depends from and therefore incorporates each of the features of new independent claim 52. Therefore, new dependent claim 53 is allowable for at least the reasons provided for new independent claim 52 as well as for the additional features recited in new dependent claim 53. For at least this reason, Applicant's representative respectfully requests that claim 53 be allowed.

---

<sup>6</sup> New independent claim 52 recites one or more features that are similar to those of now-cancelled independent claim 31.

**CONCLUSION**

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [VLEXP102USB].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,  
TUROCY & WATSON, LLP

/Deidra Ritcherson/  
Deidra Ritcherson  
Reg. No. 55,574

TUROC & WATSON, LLP  
57<sup>TH</sup> Floor, Key Tower  
127 Public Square  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731